

Remarks

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated **May 11, 2010**. The Office Action rejected claims 26, 27, 31-35, and 38-42 under 35 USC § 102(e) over Timmermans (US 5,183,085); rejected claims 19, 21, 23, 24, and 30 under 35 USC § 103(a) over Timmermans in view of Lau (US 6,165,210); rejected claim 22 under 35 USC § 103(a) over Timmermans in view of Lau in further view of Song (US 5,330,500); and rejected claims 28 and 29 under 35 USC § 103(a) over Timmermans in view of Wiktor (US 5,653,727).

Claims 19, 26, 34, and 38 are herein amended. Support for these amendments can be found in the Specification at least in paragraph [0025] of the Published Application and at least in FIG. 5 thereof as well as in the Application as-filed.

In light of the foregoing Amendments and following comments, Applicants request reconsideration.

Claim Rejections – Section 102(e)

Claims 26, 27, 31-35, and 38-42 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) over Timmermans. Independent claims 26, 34, and 38 are herein amended as shown above.

Timmermans does not disclose “portions of at least two longitudinally successive waves being in direct contact with one another when the stent is in the unexpanded configuration,” as claimed in claims 26 and 38 or “portions of at least two longitudinally adjacent spaced waves being in direct contact with one another when the stent is in the unexpanded configuration,” as claimed in claim 34. Consequently, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections – Section 103(a)

Claims 19, 21, 23, 24, and 30 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over Timmermans in view of Lau.

Independent claim 19 is herein amended to recite, in-part, “the windings including a first winding and a second winding, the first winding being longitudinally adjacent to the second winding, at least a portion of the first winding being in direct contact with at least a portion of the second winding when the stent is in the unexpanded configuration.” Neither Timmermans nor

Lau, whether considered independently or in combination, disclose, teach, suggest, or otherwise render obvious a stent as claimed. Consequently, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections.

With regard to claim 22, claim 22 depends from independent claim 19, and Song does not remedy the deficiencies of Timmermans and Lau as discussed with respect to independent claim 19. Consequently, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22.

With regard to claims 28 and 29, these claims depend from independent claim 26, and Wiktor does not remedy the deficiencies of Timmermans as discussed with respect to independent claim 26. Consequently, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26.

Conclusion

Based on at least the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 19, 21-24, 26-35, and 38-42. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: August 10, 2010

By: /Michael J. McKeen/
Michael J. McKeen
Registration No.: 66069

6640 Shady Oak Rd., Suite 400
Eden Prairie, MN 55344-7834
Telephone: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001